UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Private Property

By JESSE H. HOLMES

Parables of War and Peace

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

What Price Naval Disarmament?

By BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Lenten Reflections

By SYDNEY STRONG

VOLUME CV NUMBER 7

Chicago, April 14, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Meadville Theological School, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Unitarian Church, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Rossiter, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich, - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

A Series of Nineteen Brief Essays

entitled

"PARABLES OF WAR AND PEACE"

by

John Haynes Holmes

Editor-in-Chief of Unity

These Parables have been written by Mr. Holmes at odd times since the close of the Great War. They are meant to represent in symbolic or narrative form the basic truths of the absurdity and horror of war and of the blessing of peace. Each Parable deals imaginatively with one specific aspect of the subject.

This special series will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for April 7.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 99
Private Property—JESSE H. HOLMES..... 102
Jottings—J. H. H..... 103

ARTICLES—

The United States of Europe—*Victor Hugo*... 99
Parables of War and Peace—II. At the Root of the Tree—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 103
What Price Naval Disarmament?—I. The Stake of Security—BRENT DOW ALLINSON.. 104
S. O. Levinson's Philosophy of Peace—CURTIS W. REESE 105
Lenten Reflections—SYDNEY STRONG..... 106
Indian Nationalism and Bolshevism—TARAKNATH DAS 108

THE STUDY TABLE—

Another "Uncle Tom's Cabin"—J. T. SUNDERLAND 109
India in Bondage—CURTIS W. REESE..... 109

CORRESPONDENCE—

A Friend—Heaven's Happiest Gift—HENRY L. PETERSON 110
Can Humanity Survive Without the Church?—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH..... 110
The Kellogg Pact and the Constitution—CHESTER S. WILLIAMS..... 110
UNITY in India—S. S..... 110

THE FIELD—

The Child's Bill of Rights—*Herbert Hoover*... 111
The Church and Soviet Russia..... 111
The Right to Self-Government..... 112

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CV | MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1930 | NUMBER 7

"THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE"

We who are assembled here say to France, to England, to Prussia, to Austria, to Spain, to Italy, to Russia—we say to them, "A day will come when from your hand the arms you have grasped will fall. A day will come when war will appear as absurd and be as impossible between Paris and London, between St. Petersburg and Berlin, between Vienna and Turin, as it would be now between Rouen and Amiens, between Boston and Philadelphia. A day will come when you, France—you, Russia,—you, Italy—you, England—you, Germany—all of you, nations of the Continent, will, without losing your distinctive qualities and your glorious individuality, be blended into a superior unity, and constitute a European fraternity just as Normandy, Brittany, Burgundy have been blended into France. A day will come when the only battle-field will be the market open to commerce and the mind open to new ideas. A day will come when bullets and bombshells will be replaced by votes, by the universal suffrage of nations, by the venerable arbitration of a great sovereign Senate, which will be to Europe what the Parliament is to England, what the Diet is to Germany, what the Legislative Assembly is to France. A day will come when a cannon will be exhibited in public museums, just as an instrument of torture is now, and people will be astonished how such a thing could have been. A day will come when those two immense groups, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, shall be seen placed in presence of each other, extending the hand of friendship across the ocean, exchanging their produce, their commerce, their industry, their arts, their genius, clearing the earth, peopling the deserts, improving creation under the eye of the Creator, and uniting, for the good of all, these two irresistible and infinite powers, the fraternity of men and the power of God."

Nor is it necessary that four hundred years should pass away for that day to come. We live in a rapid period, in the most impetuous current of events and ideas which has ever borne away humanity; and at the period in which we live, a year suffices to do the work of a century.

But French, English, Germans, Russians, Slavs, Europeans, Americans, what have we to do in order to hasten the advent of that great day? We must love each other! To love each other is, in this immense labor of pacification, the best manner of aiding God!

—From the Presidential Address of Victor Hugo, International Peace Congress, 1849.

There are several reasons why we should not be editorializing on the London Conference. One is that there may not be any London Conference by the time this editorial note appears. Another is that the situation in London changes so fast that nothing set down here at this time of writing may have any applicability a fortnight hence at the time of publishing. Still another and at the moment most pressing reason is that there is no understanding the Conference. Just now we are so confused that we hardly know where we are at, to say nothing of the Conference itself. Are the American delegates in favor of a consultative pact, or are they not in favor of it? Is a consultative pact what it says it is, or is it something more, or mayhap something less? Has the Washington administration been dictating the recent moves of the delegation in London, or has the delegation been acting on its own initiative, and is there accord or discord between the two? Is France in the Conference, or to all intents and purposes has she withdrawn? These and a dozen other questions we would like to have authoritatively answered. Meanwhile, if a consultative pact is what the name seems to imply, and if the American delegates are suggesting such a pact only as an idea of getting the nations together to talk over and if possible settle a dispute before it gets to the war stage, how can anybody object to such a proposal. Isn't it always wise to confer and consult and advise? And if not, at least in the case of this blessed country of ours, why are we already a party to such a pact in the case of the Pacific agreement reached at the Washington Conference in 1922? It seems to us, all questions of confusion for the moment to one side, that the consultative pact idea is the key to the locked door which has been barring progress at London from the beginning. If this be true, why not use the key? Here is a chance to "implement" the Briand-Kellogg Treaty without resort to swords and guns.

The case of England in India has never been more frankly put than by the Manchester *Guardian* in a recent outspoken article:

"There are two chief reasons," says the paper, "why a self-regarding England may hesitate to relax her control over India. The first is that her influence in the East depends partly upon her power to summon troops and to draw resources from India in time of need. This power will vanish when India has Dominion Status. The second

is that Great Britain finds in India her best market, and that she has a thousand million of capital invested there. The British Government has already gone far towards stripping itself of power to modify India's financial and commercial policy in favor of British interests, but it is still in a position to protect them against unfair discrimination, and—what is more important—to maintain law and order without which British trade and investments must suffer, if we may not speak of Indian lives."

It is not to be supposed that this statement represents the views of the *Guardian*. This great and fearless newspaper has never been the champion of a "self-regarding" England. What it is doing here is to reveal the reality that exists behind the camouflage of England's claims to being in India for India's good. These claims are hypocrisy of the worst description. They can fool nobody at this late date. England is in India, as she has been there from the first, for nobody's good but her own. And that is the reason why she is so alarmed by the present crisis. If the situation and its outcome affected only Indians, England need not, and for that matter would not, be so greatly disturbed. We believe that she would find it possible to be reasonably philosophical if results threatened nothing but the prosperity and peace of an alien people. No, her great concern at this hour is of course for herself and the imperial interests which a century and a half of occupancy have rooted deep in the soil of this ancient land. And her concern may well be great! "The die is cast," writes M. D., in *Young India* (February 6), "and India has resolved to make Britain relax her control." Any hour, now—days before this editorial is printed perhaps—great events, irretrievable events in the matter of the relation between East and West, may be underway. Nor can any one be doubtful as to the outcome of these events. Freedom, sooner or later, sometimes at awful cost, records her victories in the unfolding annals of the race. It is written in the stars that India is destined to be free.

The Hungarians have been having a great time celebrating the tenth anniversary of the government of the Regent, Nicholas Horthy. We suppose that the devils in hell have the same festive holiday when they celebrate the successive anniversaries of the reign of Satan. Certainly there are few things more satanic in this world today than the rule of Horthy, and few things more tragic than the willingness of anybody outside of official families to rejoice on such an occasion. Characteristic of the celebration was the publication, with a great flourish of trumpets, of an amnesty. Amnesty for whom? For prisoners punished for insulting the person of the Regent—a dreadful crime!—and for minor misdemeanors liable to not more than six months' imprisonment. All other prisoners must continue to languish behind the bars, and Hungarian prisons today, as for years past, are full of victims of the counter-revolution whose only offense is that of political agitation against the despot. When the Social Democratic deputy, Györky, placed his own personal safety in hazard by insisting that a general political amnesty be included in the Jubilee Act, he was met by the Prime Minister, Count Behlen, with the retort that this was made impossible by "the danger of Bolshevism." The "red scare" is as convenient a political weapon in Hungary as it is in America—and as hypocritical, for Horthy's vengeance is by no means confined to Communists, but is lavished upon all who refuse to lick his boots. Look at the aged Pastor Hock, for example, and the distinguished Professor Jaszi, both of them exiled, and both of them as safely bourgeois as any clergymen or professors here in our own country! If good Americans want some horrors to protest against, let them turn from Soviet Russia for a moment, and glance at Horthy's bleeding land. With this nation, by the way, the United States has perfectly satisfactory diplomatic relations. No objection in Washington to anything that is going on in Hungary! Yet if Horthy's regime should be overthrown—the only thing which can bring liberty to them that are bound!—our government would undoubtedly be much disturbed. *O tempora! O mores!*

Is unemployment one of the insoluble mysteries? Is it a problem that humanity is never going to be able to work out? Look at the world today, and see the completeness of its failure to do anything about the man who is involuntarily idle! America is a thorough-going capitalist country, and capitalists tell us that capitalism is efficient. Yet President Hoover and his advisors have been worrying themselves sick for months over unemployment in the United States. In Britain, there is a Socialist Party in control of government. This party is pledged to the people to do something about unemployment in the British Isles, and has been trying faithfully to get results, but there are something like 500,000 more men and women out of work today than when Mr. MacDonald took office. It may be pleaded that the Laborites are in office but not in power, having no House of Commons majority under their control. But it would seem as though, if anything *could* be done about unemployment in England, it *would* have been done before this. Lastly,

there is Soviet Russia! No doubt about radical control in that country! And no doubt of the dogmatism of the Communist that Communism is the way to solve unemployment. Yet there are unemployed in the land of the Bolsheviks exactly as there are in other lands, and the Commissars in the Kremlin are as desperate as the President in the White House and the Prime Minister in Downing Street. What is there about this problem that is so difficult? We have seen programs without end for the conquest of idleness, but no program ever seems to work for any considerable length of time. We have listened to theories for the solution of the difficulty, but the capitalist theory seems to fail as triumphantly as the Socialist, and vice versa. Is it possible that there is something wrong with the whole mechanical structure of civilization, and that we thus produce unemployment precisely as we produce war? Or must we resort to fate, and thus classify unemployment with the weather, of which Mark Twain made the classic and never-too-familiar remark that everybody talked about it but nobody did anything?

The ingenuity of the American business mind in devising ways and means of mulcting the great American public surpasses all belief. A beautiful example of this ingenuity has just come to light in New York City. At the heart of the metropolis stands the Pennsylvania Station, one of the largest and most impressive structures of its kind in the world. This station is used at one end by the Pennsylvania Railroad, and at the other end by the Long Island Railroad. Technically the building is owned by the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the Long Island Railroad therefore has to pay a rental which is a heavy charge upon its books. But the Pennsylvania Railroad also owns the Long Island Railroad, so that the payment of this rental charge by the latter to the former is exactly equivalent to shifting a sum of money from the right-hand to the left-hand pocket of one's coat. Now the Pennsylvania Railroad has recently been engaged in boosting commuters' fares on its Long Island subsidiary. Every boost has been followed by an outcry from the commuters and a sharp negative from the Public Service Commission. The Long Island, says the Commission, is getting an adequate return on its cost of operation. A few months ago the railroad officials thought of the happy scheme of arbitrarily increasing this cost by increasing the rental paid by the Long Island for the use of the Pennsylvania Terminal. So the Pennsylvania Railroad suddenly increased the rental charge $1,500,000 a year, and the Long Island Railroad then proceeded to pass on the million and a half dollars to its commuters. Could anything be more ingenious than this? The man who conceived the plan should be given a Nobel Prize. Unfortunately, the Public Service Commission was unimpressed, and thus vetoed this scheme along with all the others. So the Pennsylvania Railroad has not yet pulled off its highway robbery of the Long Island residents. But the plan remains in memory as a flawless example of why the public hates the railroads.

If Will Hays thinks he can get away with the so-called "code of ethical practises" recently adopted by the Motion Picture Producers, he is either a much more wicked or else an infinitely more naive man than we had ever imagined. The one thing good about this latest attempt to cleanse the "movies" is the fact that it proves that recent agitation against the industry has not been in vain. The barbed arrows of such marksmen as Guy Emery Shifler, Editor of the *Churchman,* and Fred Eastman, in the *Christian Century,* at last penetrated even the elephant hide of the church elder who is czar of the industry, and made him uncomfortable enough to do something. But that any such "false facade" as this just now reared is going to divert the attention of these and other critics from the noisome and nauseous reality behind, we refuse to believe. The items of the new code are as facile as they are futile. They read with sonorous impressiveness. But what and how much do they actually mean? Thus all depends, of course, as usual, upon the application. "The use of liquor," for example, "shall be restricted to the actual requirements of characterization or plot." The requirements of some plots we have known would keep a picture afloat in liquor from the first flash to the last. "The history, institutions, prominent people and citizenry of other nations shall be represented fairly." What is "fairly"? And who is to judge? Some of the items, however, are worse than meaningless. They are out-and-out pernicious. For example, "law . . . shall not be ridiculed." Why, if a certain law is ridiculous? "No film . . . may throw ridicule on any religious faith." Why, if ridiculous faiths are flourishing abundantly about us? "Ministers of religion . . . shall not be used as comic characters or as villians." Why, if they are either, as they sometimes are? "The subject of white slavery shall not be treated on the screen." Why, if public knowledge and indignation are necessary to combat this evil? These are wrong approaches to the question. Mr. Hays must try again.

Private Property

The problems of life which press upon us are of a kind to indicate something essentially wrong about the structure of our civilization. At a time when every form of wealth is more abundant than at any other time or place in the history of the world, uncertainty of employment is also at a maximum. A world which has foresworn war constantly increases its preparations for conflict. With the fall of kings and the increase of popular power real freedom of thought and action decline. A general lip-service to democracy and equality goes along with imperialism, intolerance, race prejudice. It is not likely that these wide-spread symptoms are merely isolated discomforts; on the contrary appearing as they do the wide world over among all sorts and conditions of people they suggest the presence of some deep-seated disease, and imply the need of some major operation if our civilization is to be saved. Plenty of people die because they fear to look the facts of their physical condition in the face, minimizing their headaches and giddiness, local pains and the like, resenting any suggestion of the need for a thorough examination.

The great war discredited all of our institutions; and such increasing symptoms as those named above show plainly that that fever and delirium has not effectively burned away the roots of disease. It is the thesis of this paper that our property system is the disease.

When America was opened to settlement it was generally assumed that here was room enough and wealth enough for everyone. "Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm." Here lie these millions of unused acres, full of the stored fertility of millions of fallow years. Presently we find seemingly unlimited stores of coal, iron, gold, silver, oil. The forests are plainly unlimited. So we give freely to all comers; and now a few centuries having passed we face a situation in which our whole surface of the earth is "owned" by a fraction of our population. But everyone must live on the surface of the earth, everyone must ultimately draw his living and his wealth from it. Where then shall he live and labor? All the opportunities to work for a living belong to some one. If we are to work we must ask it as a privilege,—we may not demand it as a right. Let it be observed that while the opportunities to labor are *owned,* they are by no means all used. Those who own them are willing and anxious to have them used—on shares. We may work at profitable places on the earth's surface if we will yield a part of the product for the privilege. With many selling the privilege to labor brings in enough wealth so they have no need to produce wealth by their own labor and so we have one aspect of the problem of the unemployed: those whose "unemployment" is parasitic, who live on the labor of others. This is the form of unemployment known as leisure and is much desired and admired. It gives unlimited opportunities for amusement, for play, for culture on the part of people removed from the struggle for existence.

But this condition also produces on the part of those who actually produce the wealth of the world, just those symptoms of social disease noted above. One who receives the chance to labor as a privilege cannot possibly be either secure or free. He cannot be secure, since his opportunity to labor depends on the caprice of the owner of opportunity. He must therefore keep on good terms with him; and as owners are often like many of the rest of us narrow-minded, bigoted, ignorant, tyrannical, unreasonable, he cannot possibly be free in politics, religion, or social ideals generally. When opportunities were unlimited this situation did not appear. But increasing efficiency and the disappearance of the public domain have brought us to a point where we have more labor than we need in the basic industries, over production for the capacity of society to absorb, and the tragic unemployment of those whose "leisure" is without enforced support from the labors of others. Our unintelligent adjustment of wealth and consumers results in an "excess" of farm products, which are needed by men and women unable to buy them; in a "surplus" of coal with many suffering for warmth; in an "over-production" of fabrics with multitudes in need of clothing. If the public owned the means of production we could budget the production, arranging for just the surplus necessary for possible disasters, and reduce hours of labor for everyone until the wastefulness of overproduction is avoided. The right of everyone to his share of the products would be balanced by the duty of everyone to do his share of the work. It is absurd that the primary duty of everyone to do his full part in the necessary work of the world should be disguised as a privilege for one class, while another escapes it altogether in undeserved idleness. Moreover the first to be relieved when "unemployment" indicates that we are producing all we need, should be children, mothers, old folk, invalids and the like. In fact with our "improved" machinery which makes skill unnecessary it is likely to be the strong, the skilled, the independent, the expensive laborers who are dropped. Why pay for a man when a child can do the work?

All this stupid mismanagement centers about private property in the means of production, and with it the desire to accumulate wealth by appropriation of the labor of others. An age which regards itself as efficient should set about getting rid of this situation.

Not only does it make security and freedom impossible among laborers, but it involves inevitable conflict and probably inevitable war. Wherefore we need a new political alignment which is not afraid to face fundamentals, and which seriously undertakes increasing public control of wealth production and decreasing power in the hands of wealth possessors.

JESSE H. HOLMES.

Jottings

Secretary of War Hurley advocates military training in our schools and colleges as a necessary corrective of lawlessness. Yet, we have been noticing how military training corrects lawlessness. The same way the Canadian liquor system corrects drunkenness.

Mr. Taft was buried at Arlington "with full military honors." Bishop Shipman was buried at West Point "with full military honors." Why? Is there no way of honoring a man except by dressing up a lot of soldiers and having them parade about his coffin? Have we no imagination, that we cannot rid ourselves of the trappings of barbarism? With the fight against war on to a finish, it is time that we put our parades, celebrations, anniversaries, funerals, on something other than a military basis.

Professor Shapley, of the Harvard Observatory, states that the new planet discovered by the Lowell Observatory in Arizona "is behaving the way a planet should behave." This is pleasant! A well-behaved planet is a welcome addition to the astronomical family.

Americans last year spent $250,000,000 on art. This is $17,000,000 more than they spent on books. But how many millions less is it than they spent on cigarettes, chewing-gum, and cosmetics?

Is the public as much interested in Scarface Al Capone, the notorious criminal of Chicago, as the vast amount of space given to him in the newspapers would seem to indicate? We doubt it! Some weeks ago our newsdealer pointed our attention to a copy of *Time*, which carried a big picture of Al on its cover, and said with disgust, "Look a' that! I sell ten to twelve copies of that paper every week, and this week I ain't sold one. People don't want that mug around the house."

"Retreat," "It's A Great War," and "'Stepdaughters of War" are three new war novels not to be missed. We hope soon to publish reviews of these books in our "Study Table." J. H. H.

Parables of War and Peace

II.

At the Root of the Tree

In the Garden of Life, there grew among many trees a Tree. The roots of the Tree were as the foundations of a citadel, its bark as the steel armor of a man-of-war, its boughs as cannon, its thorns as spears. And the Tree was the Tree of War.

Now in the time of spring, the Tree put forth leaves, long leaves, and terrible! They cut the air as a submarine the waters of the sea. When the birds flew by, they seemed to lunge at their pretty wings, and when they touched them, the wings were still, and the birds sank swiftly to the earth. And they that walked in the Garden of Life were affrighted by the ugly leaves. They raised loud cries against them; and with their hands they tore them from the branches of the Tree, and strewed them on the ground. Only one cried not against the leaves nor tore them, but as one sad and over-burdened, stood apart. And the others turned upon this one, and derided him, and spat upon him. But he resisted not.

Now in the time of summer, the Tree put forth blossoms, red and white—red like the blood of men, white like the tears of women. And the blossoms sent forth a fragrance as it were the breath of those long dead; and all the things within the Garden of Life drooped and faded. And they that walked in the Garden rose up against the blossoms, and cursed them, and tore them from the branches of the Tree, and all the petals crushed to fragments. Only one cursed not the blossoms nor tore them, but wept in silence, and alone. And the others struck the one, and with fierce clamor, asked of him, "What wouldst thou?—that these blossoms should endure and waft death to all within the Garden till they do surely die?" But he answered nothing.

Now in the time of autumn, the Tree bore fruit. And as the fruit waxed, it became even as the fashion of a skull. And as the fruit ripened, it dropped to earth even as a bomb, and rent the flowers and grasses, uprooted trees, and blasted the soil till it was dust and ashes evermore. And they that walked in the Garden trembled, and were sore afraid. And some, braver than the rest, seized the fruit, to destroy it, and were themselves destroyed. Only one trembled not, nor was afraid, nor seized the ghastly fruit; but stood apart, silent, steadfast, unmovable, with countenance as terrible as day.

At last, all they that walked in the Garden, maddened with fear, sought out the one who stood alone, to slay him. And he resisted not, but looked quietly upon them, so that they were overcome, and fell back awed and wondering. And the one moved from out among them, and came to where the Tree stood like the shadow of eternal doom. And he said, "The ugly leaves are leaves of the Tree; the blossoms, red and

white, are blossoms of the Tree; the fruit of the skull is the fruit of the Tree." Then he knelt—and there upon the iron roots of the Tree, laid bare of earth, were cuts like wounds, and dripping sap like blood. And on the ground, were knives with broken blades, and axes blunt and scarred.

And the one spoke again, "Behold where I have labored while you slept, or dallied in the ways of pleasure, or talked of leaves and blossoms and fruit. Would you save the Garden? Then lay the ax at the root of the Tree, and cast it into the fire."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

What Price Naval Disarmament?

I.

The Stake of Security

It is in the international horoscope that the stain of blame for the sterile pettifogging and moral failure of the great naval conference of 1930, at London, to which the eyes of the peoples were lifted as towards the elevation of a miraculous host whose beneficent rays, charged with the outlawry of war proclaimed by the advent of the Pact of Paris, would heal the nations of their naval sins,—it is in the horoscope that the blame will be fastened on the figure of France. We rise to protest. We affirm that such verdict, however official or authenticated, however charged with the stigma of guilt or of frivolity, however disseminated from London or Washington, is a wholly superficial, largely erroneous, and sadly misleading allegation; and that it may prove to be a bitter broth of mischief if it is swallowed by the American people.

It is an allegation which will all too easily find credence among sentimentalists and moralists because of a habit of mind which seeks and accepts personal or figurative scapegoats for all disasters rather than competent analysis or honest self-questioning; because of a long-standing irritation in the United States over the procrastination of successive French governments in ratifying a debt-settlement with our Uncle Samuel which he declined to integrate with the subject of reparations (as if he were not originally implicated therein by his participation in the War), and because of a growing American dislike of European power-politics and political vindictiveness, which it is falsely assumed that France exhibits in the most offensive form. But it will be no less than a major disaster to the cause of peace, and international co-operation and security upon which peace must be built, if such should be the principal lesson read by the American people and their press in the sorry tale of the London Conference upon which so many high hopes were reared—and blasted.

The true moral of the London Conference lies elsewhere, in less obvious and skilful policies than France's; and the blame for its failure to do anything for peace ought to lie, with all charity, near at home. Who is it that has blundered? Who will tell us the humiliating truth? Who of us will believe it, if told? Surely, it cannot be the Americans!—who have only blocked the elimination of the costly superfluity of the battleship, who have given pace and go to the chauvinisms of Italy and Japan by their innocent demand for parity with the British navy, who have refused all support of the possible translation of the noble sentiment of the Briand-Kellogg Pact into the nobler experiment of political reality, who have made a continuance of the ruthless naval anarchy inevitable by declining to consider the organization of freedom and peace upon the seas in terms of sea-law and the police power of peace to defend it—the only terms in which chaos ever gave way to order anywhere. Surely, it is not the noble Americans! Of course not. . . .

Well, after three futile excursions into the Saragossa of international disarmament negotiations, we submit that it is about time the American people should begin to learn the first kindergarten lessons in the scientific art of international politics, since it is indisputable now that we can neither keep out of them nor, demonstrably, enter them with effectiveness! In these first lessons, we shall do well to attend more closely to what it is the French are saying, for their language is somewhat clearer than that of the British, and they can teach us more. Nothing of great value can be had in politics, say they, as in other fields of creative human endeavor, without paying a price for it. The American people think that they are ready and willing to pay the price of disarmament as of armament, if necessary. But are we, really? Do we even know in what currency it must be paid? . . . We are ready—it is blithely assumed by certain spokesmen—to pay heavily, if need be, in cash and coin and labor subtracted from social construction for something which is of the most questionable value to ourselves or others—something called parity with the British fleet, a navy second to none. But parity is very far from being disarmament, or even limitation; it may, indeed, be a superstition, a long step away from both, a long step backward, or in a false direction. The great and unlearned lesson of this conference, as of preceding conferences, we submit, is that the price of disarmament, and even of naval limitation, is not a physical one, cannot be paid in coin, or measured by tonnage or gunnage. The price of disarmament, as of peace, is a moral and political one. Not until it is driven into the consciousness of the American people that the things of greatest value and moment to America, even when measured in dollars and tons, are things that money cannot buy nor tons weigh, not until we can find leaders who apprehend the nature of the price of peace, and who have the courage to speak and to pay it, is there any hope of advancement towards a higher development of international organization, or towards the world commonweal. Until then we must regretfully see ourselves compelled to pay heavily in cash and mischief for doubtful and dangerous substitutes for the genuine good and gain which all men deeply desire.

It is the French who have said plainly—but we have declined to listen or to heed—that there can be no disarmament among nations without a substantial increase in security. Such may almost be accepted as a political axiom in every armed and inchoate community divided by great inequalities of wealth and power, not to mention nationalisms. The world-problem then, being essentially one of security, official and unofficial discussion must needs turn upon this theme, *not upon ratios or parities of power,* if any progress is to be hoped for. There was a moment of hope that this truth was perceived and would be held to

guide the negotiations when it was announced that the Kellogg Pact was regarded by Messrs. MacDonald and Hoover as the keystone of the proposed five-power treaty of London. But, in spite of the precautions taken to relegate the admirals to the background, so deeply is the *Anschauung* of *Machtpolitik* imbedded in the education of all of us, and of politicians and diplomats especially, that when the best of them came together at London the Kellogg Pact was promptly relegated further back than the admirals, the political problem of security was not elucidated,—save by implications of preponderant naval force,—and the whole negotiation was conducted upon the lower and furtive plane. Attempts by the French to introduce discussions of the central reality, rather than of its floating shadows, were repeatedly ignored or repulsed by Washington and the American delegation, ably seconded or prompted by the British; until progress became impossible, as might have been predicted after the first week, or even before the diplomatic big-wigs ever assembled in orotund or secretive convention.

Let us consider this important matter before the onset of a wave of vulgar cynicism, easy fatalism, or mischievous recriminations. It is evident that the principal difficulty arises from the long-standing, habitual divergence of political thinking between Europe—epitomized by modern France—and America. To the vast majority of the American people, still preoccupied with nineteenth century political conceptions, the way of national safety lies in serene or ostrich-like detachment from the shifting intrigues of European power-politics, in a proud or timid political isolationism accompanying aggressive financial intervention; and, logically, in the defense and maximization of the doctrine of neutrality and the code of neutral rights as against belligerent pretensions. It is a school of thought born of long-existing historical circumstances, grounded in high authority, and sustained by a precious tradition of national liberties and, indeed, admirable political achievement. The elaboration of the Monroe Doctrine as a protection to the New Hemisphere and its insecure republicanism is but one of the more grandiose manifestations of it. That it no longer corresponds, and for some time past has not corresponded, to the facts of America's real position, or to the exigencies of modern international life, needs, but manifestly has not, become evident even to most of the American intelligentsia, to say nothing of the Senate.

To the French, flanked as they are by nations vastly more fecund and potentially more powerful, the doctrine of American neutrality appears as one of the principal menaces to their national security; and it is believed that it is increasingly dangerous to others, as it appears that American naval parity with Britain means, potentially, cancellation of the power of the British fleet to be exercised as the chief executive factor in the system of political security through force designed at Paris in the aftermath of universal war and established at Geneva in the name and the sunshine of peace. The accredited means of security to one, the distrusted disrupter of it to the other—neutrality ought, of right and necessity, to occupy the center of all fertile thought directed to the ends of peace. And, in fact, it does, although we, the people of the United States, dislike to talk about it, preferring to believe that we can establish peace by resolution or by act of Congress! . . . The great London Conference of 1930 has failed because we have not reached, or even tried to reach, agreement concerning the future right and practice of neutrality, concerning the future use of American naval power, and concerning the true sanctions of peace and of international law as a science worthy of the serious attention of constructive men at sea in a world of chaos and increasingly long-range violence.

Our diplomatists have dealt in force, because all of us think in terms of prestige or of force, not right, most of the time. But, although peace and the disarmaments of peace do rest upon force, they rest upon moral force primarily, if not exclusively. In the absence of adequate moral force and sufficient intellectual effort to see things as they truly are, the blundering or romantic representatives of unsubstantial physical forces will rule the scene—and sooner or later make a statistical, or blind and bloody botch of it.

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

(Concluded next week)

S. O. Levinson's Philosophy of Peace

One of the most encouraging things in present day international life is the increasing acceptance of the philosophy and program of peace as conceived by S. O. Levinson. As most people now know, the peace pact was the outgrowth of his idea of outlawry. And now the London Conference is finding its hope of success in Mr. Levinson's idea of "pacific measures" as the only sanctions of peace.

A story to this effect is carried in a special cable from London by Edward Price Bell, who is credited with having brought about the conference of last summer between Premier MacDonald and President Hoover. The special cable as published in the Chicago *Daily News* of March 31st, says:

"Beneath the intricate phenomena of the five-power naval conference that is now apparently nearing a conclusion of one kind or another lies a big Chicago story. The story consists in the fact that the principle for which Great Britain and America, with, I believe, the sympathy of Italy and Japan, are fighting, is the principle embodied in the long-urged peace ideas of a Chicago man—Salmon O. Levinson, lawyer and international authority.

"In the *Christian Century* of Chicago last December 25 Mr. Levinson wrote: 'During my recent visit to Europe in numerous talks with political and other leaders of thought I became convinced that a great change is taking place there in regard to the problem of sanctions. More and more it is being recognized that the philosophy of sanctions is in its essence the philosophy of war and that putting into the same document the disavowal of war and security by sanctions of force is a fatal contradiction in terms.'

"Mr. Levinson's article was entitled 'The Sanctions of Peace' and its argument in a nutshell was that there can be no effectual opposition of war to war; that any such opposition must proceed from an inflexible resolution to stabilize peace. In case of an actual or threatened outbreak of war Mr. Levinson favored a full and frank consultation of the signatories to the Briand-Kellogg pact, but only to consider 'pacific measures' to meet the emergency and with a clear under-

standing that in no circumstances should any signatory be committed to go to war.

"This is precisely the attitude Great Britain and America would like to see accepted by all the powers in London. A full conference they would welcome, but a conference without so much as the shadow of commitment to warlike action."

Mr. Levinson in the *Christian Century* article referred to by Mr. Bell rescued the term "sanctions" from the shambles of Mars and restored it to its proper setting as a holy word. He proposed the following four sanctions of peace:

"(1) In the future all annexations and territorial acquisitions by means of war or under the menace of war, or in the presence of armed force, and all seizures or exactions by force, duress or fraud shall be null and void.

"(2) Any person, or persons, who shall advocate orally or in writing, or cause the publication of any printed matter which shall advocate the use of war between nations, in violation of the terms of the Pact of Paris, with the intent of causing war between or among nations, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be imprisoned not less than ——— years.

(3) The World Peace Court should be given jurisdiction on the petition of an interested nation to investigate the charge of a breach of the Peace Pact. The court to have the power by the free consent of the nations to hear the case in a summary way, its doors open to the press and the public. The court to have no power to enforce its decisions, but merely to ascertain the facts and make reports and decisions in aid of public opinion.

"(4) In case of the unfortunate action of any nation which amounts to an actual or immediately theatened breach of the Peace Pact, the signatories agree to communicate with one another fully and frankly in order to acquire the fullest knowledge of the situation, to consider the most efficient pacific measures to be taken jointly or separately to meet the exigencies of the particular situation and to tender friendly advice and offices to any or all the nations involved under the spirit of the Peace Pact. Such agreement to involve no commitment to armed force, no alliance, no obligation to join in any defense on the part of any signatory." CURTIS W. REESE.

Lenten Reflections

Lent is good. Any season that commands rest from flesh-eating and work is good. If ancient Hebrews when farmers found one day in seven for rest and worship a gift of God, I wonder why modern Jews and Christians when city-dwellers do not find even more rest and worship a gift from God. If physicians commanded their patients to keep one or two days holy, as Lent, and daily to read poetry—half of them would need no physicians. The same prescription worked by those weighing over 200 pounds would bring the desired reduction.

I believe in prayer. I am in good company, for so did Shakespeare and Lincoln. And so does Gandhi. Prayer is too precious to be used as powder for bullets. Dr. Parker of City Temple, London, once prayed very loud in his pulpit, "God damn the unspeakable Turk!" God didn't damn the Turk. But, that prayer was answered by the slaughter of brave British lads at Gallipoli. And, as for the Turk—he is doing better than ever.

As to the pope and others praying over Soviet Russia—there can be no objection, for prayer indicates an interest, and interest is always better than indifference. Variety is best. Better even to be hated than to be forgotten. This general prayer effort is certain to keep the one hundred and forty million Russians, with their deeds, before the public for at least a whole year. As the Americans pray for the Russians it might be well to remember that a hundred years ago a Holy Alliance was formed in the "name of the Trinity" to keep an eye on a republic growing up in the New World in the West. One result from this Holy Alliance between the monarchies of Russia, Prussia and Austria was the Monroe Doctrine, with the whole Western hemisphere going republican. And, the monarchies of Austria, Prussia and Russia—where are they?

When you pray, forgive. Necessary. Absolutely. Prayer without forgiveness is whistling to the wind. Forgive—this blots out the past and turns a sinner into a favorite of the Father. As long as men do not forgive, there will be a lake of unquenchable fire awaiting over the horizon.

When we pray, our sins, not the sins of others, should hang before our eyes. Having attended to our sins—behold, the sins of others have disappeared. Our own sins, when seen, will overthrow our enemies. There will be none.

When we pray—we should at least use the language and address of gentlemen.

No place is sacred. Jesus clearly taught that fact when he referred to a mountain in Samaria, Ebal—and to a temple in Jerusalem, Zion. I cannot imagine him fighting for a sacred spot as Christians fight over his suffered tomb. No place is sacred. The Puritans and Quakers—two dominant factors in the creation of the soul of America—had high notions about this. In an early day they turned their meeting houses into granaries to show that the building was not sacred. And, they did it because they were religious men. And, Cromwell—said to have saved "the soul of England"—stabled his horses in the cathedrals. He did this because he had found the bishops the friends of reaction, and because being a Puritan he disbelieved in "sacred places." When we pray over the sins of others, it is well to discover whether our sainted fathers did not likewise. Our sainted fathers regarded Christians and Easter as "heathenish." At any rate, it is well to have a care that our prayers do not become boomerangs, to strike back at our own family.

There is one thing more holy than prayer—it is to feed the hungry. Wise legislation? Yes. That is holy. Mr. Hoover seeking to restore employment? Yes, holy, too. Salvation Army in an emergency, doing what would be left undone? Yes, surely. Ford Tractors—which will make Russia and China and India

famine-less! It is all the work of God. Feed the hungry—I know of no more urgent command! There is a swinging gate in the kingdom of God for all who do this—open day and night, and without credentials from St. Peter. . . . I am troubled by a letter from Chuichi Ohashi, of the Japanese legation, Peking, (whom I knew in Seattle), in which he says that a "great famine is raging in the northwestern part of China. . . . Dogs and men are devouring each other. The number of dead may easily exceed the casualties of the great war. Anyone moved to send a check to China Famine Relief, 205 East 42nd Street, New York City, where money is cabled daily to Shanghai, will do something. And who can pull the string that will open Uncle Sam's pocketbook—for ship-loads of relief? Late? Yes, but some millions are still alive. What if Christendom should turn in this Lenten time and spend a billion for relief for China? The churches would then have no fear of atheism, for it is practical denial of God by his own that is atheism to be concerned over.

Humanism. What is in a name? As Robert Whitaker says, the test of Humanism—as of everything else—is the kind of man it can produce. If what is called Humanism will feed the hungry, think faster, work harder, cross more rivers, climb more mountains —for the sake of humanity—give more, sacrifice more, defend the rights of mankind more valiantly—all this and more, better than some other doctrine called orthodoxy or what not, then will Humanism find a place in the affections of mankind, and be of permanent value. The final test of Humanism, as well as of modernism or Christian Science, is the quality of the human product, to be seen on this earth and not enjoyed in any bye and bye.

The Negro. I am always glad to note signs of improvement of relations between races. I rejoice that I grew up color-blind, and it has seemed to me that America of all lands should not tolerate racial discriminations. As to the Negro, relations are materially better. Doubtless all have observed that two publications—the *Atlantic* and the *New York Times*—have announced that from this day on, the capital letter N will always be used in printing the word Negro. A good lead for every other publication. It is a good time for every American to spell his brother citizen with a capital N. Every way.

India, Gandhi, are they both on the way to Calvary? And, will it happen near "Good Friday"? Of Jesus it is pointed out that there were three stages in his career. First, as a teacher. He strove to win men by the light of truth. Crowds, but they fell away. Second, by personal leadership. Crowds, but they fell away. Then he saw that he "must die." The necessity of a Calvary is an idea worth pondering over.

Gandhi is being described as starting out with seventy companions, to begin his campaign of liberation. Jesus had seventy also. Striking parallel, with a British governor (able man) instead of a Roman governor (able man) as ruler. The Maker of history has a significant way of repeating divine tragedies. Gandhi could be Britain's saviour. He may become her judge. I am praying for Gandhi these days. Also, for Britain, that she may be wiser than Pilate and Rome.

War. There is much thinking about war and peace. In spite of clouds, the sky is fairer for peace. Whatever comes from the naval conference, mankind will never slide back into darkness, permanently. Many mistakes in this conference, which it is hoped will not be repeated in the next. The immortal Peace Pact was practically ignored. Its start in a king's palace condemned the conference to failure. Only when the wise men left the king's palace did they find the road leading to the peace-child. I am not uttering a poetic fancy, but an eternal ethical truth. The Americans were lost, when their inferiority complex got busy, and they were well subdued by tombs in Westminster, and teas with nobility. It is a pity that the conference has turned the peace efforts of the world upon gaining what at best is mere political or legal security,—meanwhile they have been neglecting the weightier matters touching peace.

My own solution for war is simple. 1. Disarm myself, absolutely. If war comes, not there. 2. Disarm family. No military training for the children. 3. Disarm my city. A gunless and gasless police. Policemen are good men, but their guns and clubs are provocative. They make for disorder and war. 4. Disarm the nation. Absolutely. Other nations would follow a nation brave enough to lead. They are waiting anxiously—from Greenland's icy mountain to India's coral strand. This is a simple solution. Yes, says one, the way of the simple-minded. No, the way of the wise, who prays that America may be good enough to live forever and forever.

President Hoover. A good man, and one hundred per cent for peace. Success to him. I have held that when the people elect a man for President, or Mayor, or Governor—every citizen should then turn in and regard him as his to support, and back him with friendly observations of approval or criticism. While we pray, let us be fair to our own officials. When one has good government in mind—carping criticism and cynicism are really disturbing.

America is getting ready for a new religion—the fruitage of 300 years of struggle for democracy, equality and the sovereignty of the people. It will be American without being nationalistic. Not everyone has noticed that there has been forming in America a calendar, quite as definite as any church calendar in use, beginning with New Year's and closing with Forefathers' Day. America has been a noble experiment to throw off Old World ideals, as represented in monarchies, aristocracies and ecclesiasticism. The time is ripe when citizens will be urged to give up allegiance to those institutions that are rooted in the Old World. America will become the "Holy Land" of all, not Palestine or Rome or Canterbury. Our "saints" will be exclusively American, not from any spirit of narrowness, but because these saints are of the New World, where the principles of equality, freedom, rights of conscience, popular sovereignty have fairly obtained. There will be an American Bible, or Bibles. The organization might take on the form of the federal constitution, with the town meeting furnishing the suggestion of a community church. I see this coming, but I do not see who will be the prophet.

When you pray, forgive. Forget? Certainly. But forgive; for, to forgive is better and more difficult than to forget. Forgive—it blots out the past and turns a sinner into a favorite of the Father.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Indian Nationalism and Bolshevism

A section of Indian nationalists, in their struggle against British Imperialism, is consciously or unconsciously inspired by the success of the Russian Revolution. Some of them are admittedly worshippers of "Communism" and believe that the Indian nationalist movement should at least in matters of foreign relations become an adjunct of Soviet Russian foreign policy. They advocate that the Indian National Congress should be *affiliated* with the Anti-Imperialist League, which regards the Indian nationalist movement as represented by the All India National Congress as merely capitalistic. The masses, the workers and peasants, of India, should not have anything to do with the Congress, but on the contrary should organize an "Anti-Imperialist League" in India to the ultimate end of the establishment of a Communist state in India.

These saviors of Indian workers and peasants believe that they should preach and practise "class war." They are anxious to propagate a doctrine which carried into practice will inevitably lead to civil war in India. All sincere Indian nationalists do not forget that "civil wars" were the principal cause of her subjections to foreign rule. They all realize the fact that the spirit of communalism (Hindu-Moslem disunity) is a great obstacle in the way of achieving national unity. *One cannot deny the fact that "Communism" as represented by the philosophy of "class war" is a violent form of communalism or tribalism;* and it will hinder the cause of national unity in India.

To be sure, some of the Indian princes and members of the landed aristocracy, and some Indian capitalists, have sided with the alien rulers of India, and have shown very little concern for the welfare of the masses. Naturally these Indian allies of foreign rulers who are determined to keep India under subjection should not be trusted as leaders or friends of the Indian nationalist movement. But to class Indian intellectuals and rich Indians as a class as enemies of Indian freedom (enemies of Indian workers and peasants) is absolutely untenable from the standpoint of actual historical facts, as demonstrated by the evolution of the whole Indian nationalist movement. No one can deny that the seed of the present revolt in India was sown by Indian intellectuals, who were supported by many well-to-do men and women. The history of the nationalist movement shows that during its infancy more than 99 per cent of those who had to suffer in prisons, by deportation to the Andaman Islands, or on the gallows, came from the intellectuals or so-called upper classes, while the workers and peasants did not take any part in it. The Indian intellectuals deliberately worked and are still working to instill national and social consciousness among the masses.

The philosophy which should guide Indian nationalists in their activities for gaining freedom is not that of the "class struggle," but co-operation among the nationalists of all strata of life to make their country free and independent. National freedom is but a means towards the betterment of the condition of the masses of India. I do not deny that the Indian masses are victims of exploitation by Indians of a certain class, while the people of India as a whole are being exploited by the British. Yet it will be a criminal folly, if Indian nationalists at any stage of their struggle for freedom, make "class war" the principal issue.

The philosophy of "class war" has been the directing principle of the Communist Party in Russia; and it has been practised through the heirarchy or autocracy of the Soviet State during the last fifteen years, supposedly to bring about a new and ideal social order. It seems that the practice of the philosophy of "class war" has brought about a new form of tyranny. It may be said that it has produced a new form of reign of terror, denying the right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness for many millions of Russia. The philosophy of "class war" practised by the Communists has undoubtedly accentuated the present "party wars" among the various brands of Communists in all lands, especially in Soviet Russia itself. The best example of it is that Trotsky, once the savior of Soviet Russia from foreign invasions, once the commander-in-chief and founder of the Red Army, is now regarded as a dangerous counter-revolutionist and has been exiled. It cannot be denied that hundreds of Russians who were the pioneers in the movement for the overthrow of Tsardom have met with death, because they dared to disagree with the present rulers of Soviet Russia.

The Indian masses, workers and peasants, are in abject poverty; and Indian nationalists must do their best to raise them from their present awful condition. But this desired change cannot be brought about by merely preaching "class war" or Bolshevism in India. The study of history does not provide one instance of the masses of any country being raised merely through a successful "class war." But it is abundantly proven in our times that any revolutionary movement which has given undue emphasis to a destructive philosophy has ultimately failed in its real purpose of bettering the condition of the people.

In all revolutionary movements "mob psychology" plays a very important part. Spectacular demonstrations and "catch phrases" always arouse the imagination of the masses who are often used by selfish and unscrupulous leaders. During the French Revolution, its leaders approved the policy of the "reign of terror," to crush opposition; but when they tried to stop the excesses, they themselves became the victims of the same "guillotine" which was used against the French aristocrats.

Some Indian political leaders feel that the application of the destructive tactics of "class war" may be an effective weapon against their enemies. They should not forget, however, that the same weapon might be used against themselves, and may eventually undermine the very existence of the nationalist movement. Recovery of Indian freedom and promotion of the genuine welfare of the people of India is the ultimate goal of the Indian nationalist movement. Therefore all activities should be directed in such a way as will lead to harmonizing the varied interests of the various strata of the vast population, affording the best opportunity for the development of national life. If the Indian movement is to become a factor for human progress, then the gravest responsibility for Indian political leaders lies in the fact that they should not allow it to degenerate into activities for spreading class or race-hatred.

TARAKNATH DAS.

The Study Table

Another "Uncle Tom's Cabin"

Mrs. Julia Ellsworth Ford has given to the world another "Uncle Tom's Cabin,"—one quite as timely and as much needed as was the great book of Mrs. Stowe. And she has done it in a story,—a story little if any less brilliant and fascinating than that of Mrs. Stowe. She calls her book "Consequences."* Readers soon discover the appropriateness of the title.

What is the world's greatest menace? Beyond question it is war. And war will remain the world's menace, unparalleled in terribleness, until our great nations discard their fear-creating, hate-creating, peril-creating great armaments, and have the wisdom to depend upon the immeasurably greater security afforded by the League of Nations, the World Court, and the Peace Pact, plus intelligent, honorable and wholly friendly diplomacy, and adequate civil police.

After war, what is the world's second gravest menace? More and more the men of most knowledge of the subject in all lands are answering, "It is *Opium*. It is the opium curse, a veritable Midgard Serpent, which is encircling and menacing the earth."

This peril gives Mrs. Ford her theme. By means of a powerful and in every way an up-to-date story she undertakes to let the startling facts be known, to the end that the peril may thus be averted.

An attractive setting of English social life, reaching out in later pages to interesting Japanese and Chinese scenes, forms the stage upon which the characters of the story play their parts of friendship and love. The persons of most importance in the book are a young English nobleman, Ramondi and a sprightly and gifted young American woman, Ann Youle. These dominate the many bright conversations and discussions which form a noteworthy and attractive feature of the story. The other characters of the book, some English, some Chinese and some Japanese, are hardly less interesting.

While the volume has opium for its central theme, it deals incidentally with many other matters. It is a broad book; a forward-looking book; a book distinctly of today. The whole influence of its leading characters and its thought is toward what may be termed liberal or advanced views in politics, social matters and religion. Thorough democrats, warm-hearted socialialists, conscientious pacifists, and believers in the might of right, will be delighted with the story; militarists, imperialists, believers in aristocracies and money-dominance, and extreme conservatives of most kinds, will not like it. The author's treatment of the opium question, her central theme, shows very extensive knowledge of the subject as well as deep interest in it. With great clearness and power she points out the insidious and terrible effects of opium on its victims, and its tragic social influence of many kinds.

Perhaps most important of all is her treatment of the political side of the opium problem—what the nations must do by concerted action to control and at no distant day to abolish the opium peril from the world. She points out that for many years the United States has been urging united action by the nations to limit the production of opium in the world to the quantity required for strictly scientific and medicinal purposes. Nearly all the highest authorities on the subject agree that this (but nothing short of this) would be effective. Such action could be brought about except for the opposition of the nations which produce and sell opium, and therefore whose finances would be affected by such limitation,—the leader of this opposition being Great Britain. The author does not hesitate to make clear Great Britain's heavy responsibility for the opium curse as it exists in the world today, especially in India and China.

While Mrs. Ford's "Consequences" is a real story, with vigor and action in every part and without a dull page, it makes no apology for being a story whose leading purpose is "propaganda"—propaganda of what the author believes are great causes of human welfare. Thus her story gets meaning and worth. Thus, too, it shames so much of the story writing of our time, which aims at nothing, means nothing, gets nowhere, and accomplishes nothing except consuming the time of its readers. The book's propaganda is largely its strength and its attraction and wholly its glory. It is propaganda of the same high kind as that of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," Mrs. Helen Hunt Jackson's "Ramona," and half the volumes (the best half) of Dickens, and many other of the most famous and most prized stories of the world.

J. T. SUNDERLAND.

*"Consequences." By Julia Ellsworth Ford, Author of "Imagina." Illustrated by Arthur Rockham and Lauren Ford. Introduction by John Haynes Holmes. The North Node Bookshop, 30 East 50th St., New York. Price $2.50.

"India in Bondage"*

Mr. Sunderland's book is comprehensive and authoritative. The truth is spoken with a directness that amounts to genius. The book accurately reveals a situation that calls to high heaven for immediate remedy. It should be read by all who have any concern for the well being of a people comprising nearly one-fifth of the human race.

It was originally published in India by R. Chatterjee of Calcutta, the publisher of the Indian magazine called "The Modern Review." But the British government arrested the publisher and confiscated the stock. Its almost instant republication in America shows how futile is the policy of suppression.

The current situation in India is rapidly moving to a climax. As I write these words, March 24, Gandhi and a group of faithful disciples are on the march to a point where they will manufacture salt and refuse to pay tax, in open violation of law. That India is on the verge of revolution is evident to anyone whose mind is open to the facts. There is much discontent. Among the causes of discontent is the failure of Great Britain to meet the Indian war-time hope for self determination. The Indians took seriously the famous fourteen points. But following the war their hope of freedom was met with the Rowlett bills, which provided for the suspension of such basic liberties as freedom of speech and person.

The Amritsar massacre and the administration of martial law which followed it wrote one of the black-

*India in Bondage. By J. T. Sunderland. Published by Lewis Copeland, New York.

est chapters in human history. As a result Indians were stirred to their depths. These and other causes of discontent are operating with precision, and it now seems as if not even dominion status could hold back the rising tide of complete independence. America's attitude toward India should be sympathetic. We ourselves were once in somewhat the position the Indians now are. We have immortalized Lafayette and shall never forget the French for the aid we received in our struggle for liberty. Whatever America can do to help India win her freedom and at the same time help Great Britain save herself must be done quickly. For Gandhi and his men are now on the march.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Correspondence

A Friend—Heaven's Happiest Gift!

Editor of UNITY: Bills are generally not welcome but it is with genuine pleasure that I send you my check for another year's subscription. Turning from our daily papers to peruse the pages of UNITY is like stepping out of a stale, musty, dark and dreary room into the bright sunshine of a spring morning. I do not agree with everything I read in UNITY but I certainly admire the spirit in which it is published, and hope that as time rolls on you may reach and influence still more people.

HENRY L. PETERSON

Dodge City, Kansas.

Can Humanity Survive Without the Church?

Editor of UNITY: One good question deserves another: Your question is, "Can religion survive without the church?" My question is, Can humanity survive without religion?

To be sure, the use we make of the word religion will determine the value of our answer. And equally to be sure, we need to remember that what is one man's religion is another man's heresy. Religion means radically different things to different minds. The less we use the word the better. It would be an easy matter to tabulate a thousand contradictory attempts to define religion. Truly there is no subject concerning which there has been so much profitless dispute, or that has been the cause of so much bitter antagonism and hateful strife.

I, for one, am strongly inclined to favor the practice of Jesus: He never used the word religion. He seems not to have admired overmuch the pious people of his time. He abominated the exhibitionism of religion. We might truthfully say the religionists were anathema to him.

According to the accepted records Jesus' thought was concerned mainly with human life and conduct—how it could be made more abundantly gracious, more filled with kindliness, compassion and good fellowship. He urged upon his hearers the spiritual way of living, which, obviously, meant to him simply the unselfish way of living. Jesus' attitude towards everything religious is fairly indicated by his statement that "The sabbath was made for man and not man for the sabbath." Man's feeling for and his treatment of his fellowman was what engaged the mind of Jesus. The spirit of love—universal love—was his antidote for all that poisons human life.

I do not see how we can do better than he did in our attempt to help build up the manhood of mankind. I will not waste time or energy in trying to destroy the ancient errors of religion. Life must be served, not religion. I will leave the dead to bury their dead. Mankind has had altogether too much religion, not enough beauty of life. I am profoundly convinced that religion in its multitudinous forms has hindered far more than it has helped in the struggle to improve the mind of man.

Why must we seek "freedom, fellowship and character *in religion?*" Can we not be content with freedom, fellowship and character in human life? Why humanize religion? Why not rather drop the disputed word, and be content to humanize our conduct toward one another?

"Heresy to the heretic, and religion to the orthodox, but the dust of the rose-petal belongs to the heart of the perfume-seller."

Let me add:

Attainment is ours, O Soul!
Divine attainment!
When we seek it for all.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH

Crawford, Colo.

The Kellogg Pact and the Constitution

Editor of UNITY: I was interested in reading Vaughn Bachman Brokaw's letter to the editor in which it was maintained that the "Constitution itself must be amended if this nation is to disarm constitutionally".

There are a great many people who refuse to recognize that mankind is slow to do the extremely difficult thing, slow to repudiate the traditional instruments of government, and slow to make radical changes no matter how sensible sounding. These people seem to insist on making the road to world peace as difficult as possible.

Thus, does this proposition to change the Constitution in order to provide a basis for disarmament appeal to me. Such a suggestion only serves to send people who have ventured out from the militaristic position with so intelligent a document as the Kellogg Pact rushing back to their battleships to entrench themselves behind a thousand arguments.

There is nothing in our Constitution which stands in the way of rapid and thorough disarmament. The document very happily provides *that a treaty, or international agreement, duly engaged in, becomes the supreme law of the land.* Thus the Kellogg Pact is above the Constitution. Thus the Washington treaty is above the Constitution. Thus the signing of a League Covenant would be above the Constitution, just as the various peace treaties are superior to the authority of the Constitution.

MacDonald's whole point of view rests upon the proposition that natural honor consists in keeping treaty promises as the supreme law of the land engaged in them. Supposing the proponents of peace, should make easy the road, by requiring only that we should follow the Constitution in its great international provision, and carry out sincerely our treaty obligations.

The Kellogg Pact is a treaty obligation, and if it be so regarded as the supreme law of the land, it necessarily follows that drastic and progressive disarmament must come quickly. If we intend along with other signatories to follow its mandates, we cannot maintain such large armed forces either on land or sea. If the London Conference fails to obtain drastic reductions, every government can be accused of acting unconstitutionally, out of harmony, and contrary to their solemn agreements.

Let's fight this battle from the advantageous position we have so recently conquered. Let's use the force of patriotism, national honor, spirit of constitutions, to demand fast moves toward disarmament. The Kellogg Pact has placed the Big Navy men in the roles of traitors, unpatriotic, and unconstitutional in all actions for increased forces.

CHESTER S. WILLIAMS

UNITY in India

Editor of UNITY:

I am an humble clerk employed in an office of the Punjab Government. I took my degree with honours (four year course at the Punjab University) in 1924. Spent two more years in post-graduate work in chemistry, carried out a piece of original research work and was awarded the highest degree of the university—M. Sc. Remained unemployed for two years and four months and am holding the present job for the last year and a half. My present salary is Rs 53/ per month—roughly 18 dollars.

These conditions of life have not depressed me. My zeal for knowledge is as strong as ever. I am fairly in contact with the modern developments in religion, economics, politics and society in general. I eagerly read your most admirable paper in the "People's Library" but unfortunately

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Child's Bill of Rights

The ideal to which we should strive is that there shall be no child in America:

That has not been born under proper conditions

That does not live in hygienic surroundings

That ever suffers from under-nourishment

That does not have prompt and efficient medical attention and inspection

That does not receive primary instruction in the elements of hygiene and good health

That has not the complete birthright of a sound mind in a sound body

That has not the encouragement to express in fullest measure the spirit within which is the final endowment of every human being.

Herbert Hoover

—American Child Health Association, New York.

The Church and Soviet Russia

I.

The following statement on the religious persecutions in Russia, signed by eighty-seven (87) ministers, rabbis, and other churchmen, was recently issued in New York:

We, the undersigned ministers and other churchmen, recognizing the naturalness of the protests against the anti-religious campaign in Russia, regret that a note of humility and a recognition of the historical facts which have caused this policy have been omitted from these protests. The Church in Russia has tended to align itself with the instruments of oppression against which the revolution was a reaction, and we confess that all religious institutions have contained this tendency to become identified with the dominant economic and social order of their environment. Indeed, we believe that anti-religious communism is a product of the failure of the churches to recognize their obligations to the social and economic needs of the people.

We deplore and denounce the intolerance which induces the Soviet Government to prohibit the free exercise of religion; we hold no brief for communism as a political creed, but we believe that whatever values may be born out of the Russian social experiment should be given the opportunity to mature.

In dissociating ourselves from a protest which tends to raise higher already existing barriers, we would urge a discriminating appreciation of all efforts to bring about a closer mutual understanding between the Russian people and the outside world. We, therefore, believe that the most strategic method of combating the anti-religious policy of the Communists is to prove to them that their policy is based upon a distorted conception of religion, and that this can best be done by increasing our own efforts for a cooperative and just society.

In order, then, that a liberal, intelligent and comprehensive plan may be developed to meet the implications of this whole question, we hope that an adequate commission of research and inquiry may be established which will bring forth a program for discussion and action.

Among the signers were the following:

Edmund B. Chaffee, J. Franklin Carter, Everett R. Clinchy, Russell J. Clinchy, Henry Sloane Coffin, E. H. Dickinson, Harrison S. Elliott, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Erdman Harris, Maurice H. Harris, John Haynes Holmes, Clarence V. Howell, Finis S. Idleman, Paul Jones, Meredith MacColl, Reinhold Niebuhr, Arthur L. Swift, Jr., Samuel Schulman, G. M. Stockdale, J. Max Weis, Jonah B. Wise, Harry F. Ward, Alfred E. Willett.

II.

The following statement, signed by professors and students of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, was also recently published:

"We, the undersigned students and professors of Union Theological Seminary, view with concern the general protest being made against the policy of the Soviet Government in regard to organized religion. While we deplore persecution in any form, we recognize that the Orthodox Church in Russia was closely identified with the old Czarist regime and all the forces of former oppression against which the Communist attack was directed. Nor can we regard with absolute complacency the tendency throughout history of institutional religion to lend its sanction to existing economic order and the established class divisions in society.

"While professing no allegiance to the political creed of communism, we believe that the social experiment of the Soviet Government should receive the sympathetic and not the hostile criticism of the representatives of the Christian Church. Moreover, we feel that the protest, in tending to antagonize rather than to conciliate, is contrary to the spirit and the best tradition of Christianity. Nor can we be assured that the religious protest is free from political implications and see a grave danger in the Church aligning itself with forces hostile to the Soviet Government on other than political grounds. The fact that the Russian people regard the move as a political threat cannot be discounted in its entirety.

"We feel that the protest is likely to contribute to those forces jeopardizing the peace of the world by maintaining barriers against closer relationships with Russian people, and as a first step toward breaking down such barriers and promoting a more friendly understanding with Russia we deem imperative the recognition of the Soviet Government by the other nations of the world."

The professors who signed the report are:

Reinhold Niebuhr, Eugene Lyman, Harry F. Ward, Arthur L. Swift, Chas.

---

it is so popular with the editorial staff of the "People" that it is placed in the reading room after much delay and sometimes it is not placed at all. What impresses me most in your paper is not only the vast outlook on life that the editors command but the most wonderful level-headedness which the paper brings to bear on every topic of life. The sanity and the clear-headedness of the editor, Mr. Holmes, astonishes me and I keep wondering that God's human beings are capable of so much.

On one point I sharply differ from Mr. Holmes. That is about the possibility of miracles. There is no doubt that most of that what people call miracles is mere superstition, but in spite of that I honestly thing that there is some truth in miracles. One such miracle I witnessed with my own "scientific" eyes. A few months back an ascetic from the Himalayas came down into the plains and gave a performance (without charging any fee for it) before an audience of about one thousand in Lahore. About a quarter of ton of wood was burned in an open space. When active combustion had ceased the heap of red living charcoals was spread on the ground covering about six square yards, the layer being about three to six inches high. The ascetic then washed his feet thoroughly with fresh water, performed his prayers for a few minutes, and then put himself into a sort of fit, his naked body violently shivering all over. Bowing low before the mass of fire he firmly stepped into the heap with his feet and legs quite naked. He walked about among the burning charcoals for almost a minute. Then he began to dance in the fire which lasted three minutes. All were spell-bound. He came out quite composed, offered his thanks to the fire for not hurting him and left the place. Before leaving I had the curiosity to see his feet with my own scientific eyes. The same were absolutely unhurt. This miracle I had the good luck to see with my own eyes, but I have heard of many more similar and still more astounding phenomena from sources that are absolutely above suspicion.

My own explanation of these phenomena is simple. Every human being has within him potential powers which if properly developed by the concentration of the mind are actually so mighty that they can keep in abeyance the ordinary forces of nature if the subject so desires. By writing the above I am not anxious to convert Mr. Holmes to my views. I only request him to keep his mind open on the subject of miracles, and pursue its study in the humble spirit of a seeker after truth. Those who have done it affirm as honestly and earnestly (as he denies the same) that there exist in the universe of ours forces far mightier than those with which we the matter-of-fact men are familiar so far.

In the end I offer you my apologies for not sending you this letter in type, the only excuse being my poverty. Hoping to hear from you soon. S. S.

Lahore, India.

C. Webber, Gaylord White, Theodore K. Noss, A. Bruce Curry, Erdman Harris, John Bennett.

The Right to Self-Government

"There is a strong desire on the part of the educated Indians to govern their own country. Education makes rebels against invaders and conquerers. Young Indians know the long and glorious struggle of the English people against absolute monarchy; they also know the story of Washington and the American Revolution. These histories cannot be read by men whose country is under a foreign yoke without inspiring in them an invincible resolve to free and govern their own country . . . I do not believe God ever made any man or any nation good enough to rule another man or another nation."

—Andrew Carnegie.

"In all ages of the world tyrants have justified themselves in conquering and enslaving peoples by declaring that they were doing it for their benefit. Turn it whatever way you will, whether it comes from the mouth of a king of from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for their enslaving the men of some other race, it is the same old serpent. They all say that they bestride the necks of the people not because they want to do this but because the people are so much better off for being ridden."

—Abraham Lincoln.

"I know of nothing more extraordinary than that any American could think or speak favorably or even tolerantly of political absolutism, political despotism, that which exists in India today, or any other. If America does not stand for free government everywhere, will some one kindly tell me what it does stand for? The idea that we are to applaud political autocracy because it is British is somewhat refreshing. Does wearing the British name change its character? We are not called upon to admire absolutism because it is Russian or was at one time Prussian. There is no more reason why we should admire or tolerate it because it is British. The subjugation and rule of one nation by another, wherever it may be found, is loathsome, hateful, poisonous to the people who are compelled to live under it. Yet this is what we have in India,—a foreign rule forced on a great civilized people by the power of the bayonet, and the bomb bearing aeroplane."

—Charles Edward Russell, American Diplomat and Author.

"The millions of India have bowed their necks beneath the yoke of many conquerers, but worst of all is the steady grinding weight of the English domination—A weight which is literally crushing millions out of existence, and, as shown by English writers themselves, is tending inevitably to a wide catastrophe."

—Henry George, in "Progress and Poverty."

A Timely New Book

PALESTINE

TODAY AND TOMORROW

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Dr. Stephen S. Wise says: "It is the most understanding book that has been written about Palestine." It is also a most revealing book, based on a recent journey through Palestine and written largely since the recent riots between Jews and Arabs. The Zionist movement in all its aspects is graphically surveyed. You will finish this unusual exposition with a new understanding of Palestine and its problems.

Just Published by THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Price $2.50

Order from UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

IN APRIL
Comes Easter as the signal for introducing your clothes of a new season. Spring demands an appropriate wardrobe—and there is no greater economy to be practiced than the use of our service which so expertly cleanses and freshens each previously worn garment that you send us.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Chateau de Bures
par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise
17 Miles from Paris, France
Country Boarding School
To Prepare Boys for American Colleges
30 Acres Own Farm
New Dormitories With Outdoor Sleeping Porches
Gymnasium. Athletic Fields
Modern, Progressive Methods
Music, Art, Sciences
English, French, and American Masters
For information address
EDWIN CORNELL ZAVITZ, Headmaster
Chateau de Bures, par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise, France

LIFT UP YOUR HEARTS
A Hundred Aspirations Towards Peace and Goodwill
By WALTER WALSH, D.D.
"The one hundred prayers gathered in this volume are infinitely precious."—*Unity.*
"Very beautifully expressed, phrased in golden words."—*The Inquirer.*
5s. net. Postage 4d.
WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 38 Gr. Ormond St., London, W. C. 1 England